

18, of which 5 are described as new and three others previously described are reinstated. *O. a. arenicola* Henshaw is treated as a synonym of *O. a. leucolæma* Coues, the habitat and characters of which were misinterpreted by Mr. Henshaw, whose ruling in the case has heretofore been followed. The subspecies *praticola*, *giraudi*, *merrilli*, *strigata*, *rubea*, *adusta*, and *pallida* stand practically as heretofore. True *alpestris* is restricted (in the breeding season) to northeastern North America, from Newfoundland northward, the Old World form of this group standing as *fulva* (Gmelin). *O. a. leucolæma* of Henshaw and Dwight (not of Coues) is separated into an Alaskan form *arctica* (subsp. nov.) and *hoyti* Bishop, the latter occupying the Mackenzie Valley region. *O. a. euthymia* (subsp. nov.) fills in the small gap between the breeding ranges of *praticola*, *hoyti* and *leucolæma* (Saskatchewan and Assiniboia south to northern North Dakota). *O. a. insularis* of Townsend and *occidentalis* of McCall are rehabilitated, and the new forms *actia*, *ammophila* and *leucansiptila* occupy, respectively, small areas of the coast region of southern California and northern Lower California, the Mohave Desert and Owens Valley, and the region about Yuma, Arizona.

The paper is illustrated by six photographic illustrations showing different types of environment, and by four maps showing (1) the range of the genus, (2) the breeding areas of the American forms, and (3 and 4) the breeding areas of the Old World forms. These areas are necessarily in part hypothetical, especially for the Old World forms, and the number and relations of the forms can hardly be said to be as yet reduced to a certainty. Mr. Oberholser's review, however, is an important contribution to a most difficult subject, and will doubtless stand as the 'last word' for some time to come, although, in the nature of the case, his results must be held as more or less tentative. The identification of our Horned Larks is of course rendered more difficult through the increased number of forms, and only an *Otocoris* expert can hope to identify isolated specimens, especially when we find that three forms — *alpestris*, *hoyti* and *praticola* — are recorded from Long Island, New York, and that one of them, *praticola*, is liable to turn up as far west as central Arizona. — J. A. A.

Ogilvie-Grant on Recently Described American Gallinæ.— In an article in the April number of 'The Ibis' Mr. Ogilvie-Grant gives his opinion,¹ *ex cathedra*, concerning certain North American rasorial birds recently described by some of his American confrères. Whatever may be the case as regards available material from Mexico — we leave this phase of the subject to those most interested — when the comparative resources of the British Museum collection are in question, we feel sure

¹ Remarks on the Species of American Gallinæ recently described, and Notes on their Nomenclature. By W. R. Ogilvie-Grant. Ibis, April, 1902, pp. 233–245.

that we on this side of the water are not 'out in the cold' when it comes to the consideration of the North American Tetraonidæ. Mr. Grant gives a list of such of the "new species and subspecies of American Game-birds," described since 1893, as he does not approve, "with remarks on and identifications of those which are not considered valid by the writer, and with his reasons for proposing to suppress them."

The first on the list is *Lagopus leucurus altipetens* Osgood, of which he says: "I have compared three *adult males in autumn plumage* from Colorado (one being from Blaine's Peak, the typical locality of *L. l. altipetens*) with two males and a female in autumn plumage from the Cascade Mountains, and find them absolutely identical." This disposes, from Mr. Grant's point of view, of the whole case of *L. l. altipetens*, he apparently being quite unaware that his comparison of specimens from Colorado and the Cascade Mountains has no bearing on the case. The status of the Alaska form, which is the question at issue, is not touched. A comparison of a large series in the American Museum from the Kenai Peninsula with other comparable material from Colorado shows a very striking difference between the two forms, both in size and coloration, a difference that probably Mr. Grant could not fail to recognize if he had the same material. In all probability the birds from the Cascade Mountains and Colorado are not different, and so far as we know no difference between them has been claimed. We doubt, also, whether birds from latitude 54° in the Rocky Mountains, the type region of *L. leucurus* Swainson, would prove separable from the Colorado bird, judging from winter specimens from Alberta. In other words, Mr. Osgood should probably have named the Alaska form instead of that from Colorado. So much then for Mr. Grant's first case on his list.

The second case is that of *Canachites canadensis* and its subspecies, none of which, of course, Mr. Grant admits. The A. O. U. Committee has recently gone over the subject with care, with abundant material, and found no difficulty in recognizing three forms (see this number of 'The Auk,' pp. 317, 318), in spite of "all the alleged differences in plumage being fully accounted for by season or age, and being in no way dependent on locality," as shown by Mr. Grant's material. As the amount of material examined in this case is large, and the same conclusions have been reached by several independent investigators outside of the A. O. U. Committee, we must account for this discrepancy of opinion between Mr. Grant and his American confrères on the basis of a radical difference in the point of view from which the subject is approached by the parties in controversy. In fact, we could expect from Mr. Grant no other conclusion, when we recall his position in relation to the *Bonasa umbellus* group (Cat. Bds. Brit. Mus., XXII, p. 87).

His third, and the last case we have space in this connection to notice, is the 'Turkey question,' where Mr. Grant differs from American ornithologists both as regards points of nomenclature and the admission of both species and subspecies. While he admits two species and two sub-

species (Cat. Bds. Br. Mus., XXII, pp. 387-390), or four forms in all, the same number as is recognized in the A. O. U. Check-List, which has four subspecies, he claims that Mr. Nelson in his description of his *Meleagris gallopavo merriami*, "avoided" comparing it with *M. g. intermedia*, "with which," says Mr. Grant, "his birds are obviously synonymous." We can assure Mr. Grant that, however that may have been, the two forms have since been carefully compared by others, with the result that, from the American point of view, they are considered separable (see *postea*, p. 318).

It would obviously be a waste of time to discuss the question of names, as between *gallopavo* and *mexicana*, but we may add that we fail to find "*Meleagris silvestris* Vieillot" at the place cited, namely, "Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat. IX, p. 447 (1817)," nor elsewhere in Vieillot's writings, although we do find at just that point *Meleagris fera*, as well as in the Gal. Ois. II, 1825, p. 10, pl. 201. But we do find "?*Meleagris sylvestris*, Vieill.; *Pr. Bonap. Am. Orn.* pl. 9" in G. R. Gray's 'List of the Specimens of Birds in the Collection of the British Museum, Part V, Gallinæ,' 1867, p. 42. Turning to Bonaparte's 'American Ornithology,' Vol. I, 1825, we find "*Meleagris Gallopavo*" on plate 9, and "*Meleagris sylvestris*, Vieill. *Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat.* IX, p. 447," in his extensive list of citations on p. 79, which appears to be the origin of this reference as given later in Jardine's edition of Wilson's Ornithology and elsewhere. But we do not find the spelling *silvestris* as given by Mr. Grant. As both Cones and Elliot (*cf.* Auk, XIV, p. 231, and Grant, Ibis, April, 1902, p. 237) were misled by Mr. Grant's erroneous citation of Vieillot, perhaps after referring as follows to Mr. Elliot's statement regarding the Vieillot reference: "This inaccurate statement needs no further comment," he will kindly tell these unenlightened American ornithologists just where to find "*Meleagris silvestris* Vieill.," and thus confer a favor.—J. A. A.

Clark's 'Birds of Lakeside and Prairie.'¹ — "The lakesides and prairies of the Middle West are rich in bird life. The opera glass is a much more satisfactory field companion than the shot gun." These extracts from the author's preface indicate at once the scope and spirit of this recent contribution to popular ornithology. The book consists of fourteen short chapters, parts of which have previously appeared in print, the titles of which suggest their character, as: 'Birds of a Smoky City'; 'The Songsters of the Skokie [Swamp]'; 'In Southern Hoosier Hills'; 'In Winter Fields'; 'On the Trail of Pokagon,' etc. The author shows himself to be familiar with his subject, writes pleasantly, and has thus been able to give to the public another very readable book about birds. The colored illustrations are from the well-known magazine 'Birds,' or 'Birds

¹ Birds of Lakeside | and Prairie | By | Edward B. Clark | With Sixteen Illustrations in color | A. W. Mumford, Publisher | Chicago and New York. Sm. 4to, pp. 150.